

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7  
8

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9  
10  
11

KATHLEEN ESPINOSA, et al.,

No. C 06-04686 JSW

Plaintiffs,

**COURT'S INTENDED SPECIAL  
VERDICT FORM**

v.

12  
13  
14

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

15  
16  
17  
18

1. Do you find that Minor Asa I. Sullivan ("Minor Sullivan") proved by a  
preponderance of the evidence that the tenants, Jarrett Schank and Bryant Gudor, did not  
abandon their lease at 2 Garces Drive before June 6, 2006?

19  
20  
21

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 2. If you answered "No"  
to Question 1, please proceed to Question 6.**

22  
23  
24  
25  
26

2. Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that 2 Garces Drive had been  
abandoned and/or that the landlord, or an authorized agent of the landlord, did not consent to  
the entry and search?

27  
28

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3. If you answered "No"  
to Question 2, please proceed to Question 6.**

1           3.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2     Mr. Sullivan had a legitimate expectation of privacy at 2 Garces Drive on June 6, 2006?

3     Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

4     **If you answered "Yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4. If you answered "No"**  
5     **to Question 3, please proceed to Question 6.**

6  
7           4.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
8     the Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that there was an emergency at  
9     hand and there was an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property  
10    and/or that the search's scope and manner were not reasonable to meet the need.

11    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

12    **If you answered "Yes" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 5. If you answered "No"**  
13    **to Question 4, please proceed to Question 6.**

14  
15           5.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
16     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
17     Constitution to be free from an unreasonable search when they entered and searched 2 Garces  
18     Drive?

19    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

20    **Please proceed to Question 6.**

21  
22           6.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
23     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
24     Constitution to be free from excessive force when he pointed his firearm at Mr. Sullivan?

25    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

26    **Please proceed to Question 7.**

1       7.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2 the Defendant Officers deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
3 Constitution to be free from excessive force when they when they used deadly force against Mr.  
4 Sullivan?

5 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

6 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

7 **Please proceed to Question 8.**

8  
9       8.     **If you answered “No” to Questions 5 and 6, skip this Question and please**  
10 **proceed to Question 9.** If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan’s Fourth  
11 Amendment rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive or by the pointing of firearms at  
12 Mr. Sullivan, do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
13 Officer Morgado intentionally or recklessly provoked a violent response from Mr. Sullivan  
14 when he violated his Fourth Amendment Rights.

15 Answer “Yes” or “No” : \_\_\_\_\_

16 **Please proceed to Question 9.**

17  
18       9.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
19 the Defendant Officers were negligent in their use of deadly force against Mr. Sullivan?

20 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

21 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

22 **If you answered “Yes” to Question 9 as to either Officer Alvis or Officer Keesor, please**  
23 **proceed to Question 10. If you answered “No” to Question 9 as to both Officer Alvis or**  
24 **Officer Keesor, please proceed to Question 12.**

25  
26       10.    Do you find that the Defendant Officers proved by a preponderance of the  
27 evidence that Mr. Sullivan was negligent and Mr. Sullivan’s negligence was a substantial factor  
28 in causing his death.

1 Answer "Yes" or "No" \_\_\_\_\_

2 **Please proceed to Question 11.**

3  
4 11. What percentage of fault do you attribute to each person below? Your answer  
5 may be zero.

6 Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

7 Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

8 Mr. Sullivan: \_\_\_\_\_

9 **Please proceed to Question 12.**

10  
11 12. If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan's Fourth Amendment  
12 rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive and/or by the pointing of firearms at Mr.  
13 Sullivan, and/or that Officer Alvis and/or Officer Keesor violated Mr. Sullivan's Fourth  
14 Amendment rights by the use of deadly force against him, do you find that Minor Sullivan  
15 proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant Officers intentionally interfered  
16 with or attempted to interfere with Mr. Sullivan's civil rights by threatening or committing  
17 violent acts.

18 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Morgado and the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive:

19 \_\_\_\_\_

20 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Morgado and the pointing of firearms at Mr. Sullivan:

21 \_\_\_\_\_

22 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Alvis and the use of deadly force:

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Keesor and the use of deadly force:

25 \_\_\_\_\_

26 **Please proceed to Question 13.**

1 13. If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, what  
2 damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved  
3 by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Constitutional violation(s).

4 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

5 If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, but found  
6 that Minor Sullivan failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that any actual damages  
7 were caused by the Constitutional violation(s), you shall return an award of nominal damages  
8 not to exceed one dollar.

9 **Please proceed to Question 14.**

10  
11 14. If you answered "Yes" to Question 12, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan,  
12 as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were  
13 caused by the violation.

14 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

15 **Please proceed to Question 15.**

16  
17 15. If you answered "Yes" to Question 9, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as  
18 an individual, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Defendant  
19 Officers' conduct.

20 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

21 **Please sign, date and return this verdict form to the clerk or court security officer.**

22  
23  
24 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

25 **FOREPERSON**

26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7  
8

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9  
10  
11

KATHLEEN ESPINOSA, et al.,

No. C 06-04686 JSW

Plaintiffs,

**COURT'S INTENDED SPECIAL  
VERDICT FORM**

v.

12  
13  
14

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,

Defendants.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1. Do you find that Minor Asa I. Sullivan ("Minor Sullivan") proved by a  
preponderance of the evidence that the tenants, Jarrett Schank and Bryant Gudor, did not  
abandon their lease at 2 Garces Drive before June 6, 2006?

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 2. If you answered "No"  
to Question 1, please proceed to Question 6.**

2. Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that 2 Garces Drive had been  
abandoned and/or that the landlord, or an authorized agent of the landlord, did not consent to  
the entry and search?

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3. If you answered "No"  
to Question 2, please proceed to Question 6.**

1       3.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2     Mr. Sullivan had a legitimate expectation of privacy at 2 Garces Drive on June 6, 2006?

3     Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

4     **If you answered "Yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4. If you answered "No"**  
5     **to Question 3, please proceed to Question 6.**

6  
7       4.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
8     the Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that there was an emergency at  
9     hand and there was an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property  
10    and/or that the search's scope and manner were not reasonable to meet the need.

11    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

12    **If you answered "Yes" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 5. If you answered "No"**  
13    **to Question 4, please proceed to Question 6.**

14  
15      5.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
16     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
17     Constitution to be free from an unreasonable search when they entered and searched 2 Garces  
18     Drive?

19    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

20    **Please proceed to Question 6.**

21  
22      6.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
23     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
24     Constitution to be free from excessive force when he pointed his firearm at Mr. Sullivan?

25    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

26    **Please proceed to Question 7.**

1       7.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2 the Defendant Officers deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
3 Constitution to be free from excessive force when they when they used deadly force against Mr.  
4 Sullivan?

5 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

6 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

7 **Please proceed to Question 8.**

8  
9       8.     **If you answered “No” to Questions 5 and 6, skip this Question and please**  
10 **proceed to Question 9.** If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan’s Fourth  
11 Amendment rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive or by the pointing of firearms at  
12 Mr. Sullivan, do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
13 Officer Morgado intentionally or recklessly provoked a violent response from Mr. Sullivan  
14 when he violated his Fourth Amendment Rights.

15 Answer “Yes” or “No” : \_\_\_\_\_

16 **Please proceed to Question 9.**

17  
18       9.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
19 the Defendant Officers were negligent in their use of deadly force against Mr. Sullivan?

20 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

21 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

22 **If you answered “Yes” to Question 9 as to either Officer Alvis or Officer Keesor, please**  
23 **proceed to Question 10. If you answered “No” to Question 9 as to both Officer Alvis or**  
24 **Officer Keesor, please proceed to Question 12.**

25  
26       10.    Do you find that the Defendant Officers proved by a preponderance of the  
27 evidence that Mr. Sullivan was negligent and Mr. Sullivan’s negligence was a substantial factor  
28 in causing his death.

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1 Answer “Yes” or “No” \_\_\_\_\_

2 **Please proceed to Question 11.**

3  
4 11. What percentage of fault do you attribute to each person below? Your answer  
5 may be zero.

6 Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

7 Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

8 Mr. Sullivan: \_\_\_\_\_

9 **Please proceed to Question 12.**

10  
11 12. If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan’s Fourth Amendment  
12 rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive and/or by the pointing of firearms at Mr.  
13 Sullivan, and/or that Officer Alvis and/or Officer Keesor violated Mr. Sullivan’s Fourth  
14 Amendment rights by the use of deadly force against him, do you find that Minor Sullivan  
15 proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant Officers intentionally interfered  
16 with or attempted to interfere with Mr. Sullivan’s civil rights by threatening or committing  
17 violent acts.

18 Answer “Yes” or “No” as to Officer Morgado and the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive:

19 \_\_\_\_\_

20 Answer “Yes” or “No” as to Officer Morgado and the pointing of firearms at Mr. Sullivan:

21 \_\_\_\_\_

22 Answer “Yes” or “No” as to Officer Alvis and the use of deadly force:

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 Answer “Yes” or “No” as to Officer Keesor and the use of deadly force:

25 \_\_\_\_\_

26 **Please proceed to Question 13.**

27

28

1 13. If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, what  
2 damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved  
3 by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Constitutional violation(s).

4 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

5 If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, but found  
6 that Minor Sullivan failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that any actual damages  
7 were caused by the Constitutional violation(s), you shall return an award of nominal damages  
8 not to exceed one dollar.

9 **Please proceed to Question 14.**

10  
11 14. If you answered "Yes" to Question 12, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan,  
12 as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were  
13 caused by the violation.

14 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

15 **Please proceed to Question 15.**

16  
17 15. If you answered "Yes" to Question 9, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as  
18 an individual, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Defendant  
19 Officers' conduct.

20 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

21 **Please sign, date and return this verdict form to the clerk or court security officer.**

22  
23  
24 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

25 **FOREPERSON**

26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7  
8

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9  
10  
11

KATHLEEN ESPINOSA, et al.,

No. C 06-04686 JSW

Plaintiffs,

**COURT'S INTENDED SPECIAL  
VERDICT FORM**

v.

12  
13  
14

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,

Defendants.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1. Do you find that Minor Asa I. Sullivan ("Minor Sullivan") proved by a  
preponderance of the evidence that the tenants, Jarrett Schank and Bryant Gudor, did not  
abandon their lease at 2 Garces Drive before June 6, 2006?

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 2. If you answered "No"  
to Question 1, please proceed to Question 6.**

2. Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that 2 Garces Drive had been  
abandoned and/or that the landlord, or an authorized agent of the landlord, did not consent to  
the entry and search?

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3. If you answered "No"  
to Question 2, please proceed to Question 6.**

1           3.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2     Mr. Sullivan had a legitimate expectation of privacy at 2 Garces Drive on June 6, 2006?

3     Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

4     **If you answered "Yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4. If you answered "No"**  
5     **to Question 3, please proceed to Question 6.**

6  
7           4.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
8     the Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that there was an emergency at  
9     hand and there was an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property  
10    and/or that the search's scope and manner were not reasonable to meet the need.

11    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

12    **If you answered "Yes" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 5. If you answered "No"**  
13    **to Question 4, please proceed to Question 6.**

14  
15           5.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
16     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
17     Constitution to be free from an unreasonable search when they entered and searched 2 Garces  
18     Drive?

19    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

20    **Please proceed to Question 6.**

21  
22           6.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
23     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
24     Constitution to be free from excessive force when he pointed his firearm at Mr. Sullivan?

25    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

26    **Please proceed to Question 7.**

1       7.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2 the Defendant Officers deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
3 Constitution to be free from excessive force when they when they used deadly force against Mr.  
4 Sullivan?

5 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

6 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

7 **Please proceed to Question 8.**

8  
9       8.     **If you answered “No” to Questions 5 and 6, skip this Question and please**  
10 **proceed to Question 9.** If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan’s Fourth  
11 Amendment rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive or by the pointing of firearms at  
12 Mr. Sullivan, do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
13 Officer Morgado intentionally or recklessly provoked a violent response from Mr. Sullivan  
14 when he violated his Fourth Amendment Rights.

15 Answer “Yes” or “No” : \_\_\_\_\_

16 **Please proceed to Question 9.**

17  
18       9.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
19 the Defendant Officers were negligent in their use of deadly force against Mr. Sullivan?

20 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

21 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

22 **If you answered “Yes” to Question 9 as to either Officer Alvis or Officer Keesor, please**  
23 **proceed to Question 10. If you answered “No” to Question 9 as to both Officer Alvis or**  
24 **Officer Keesor, please proceed to Question 12.**

25  
26       10.    Do you find that the Defendant Officers proved by a preponderance of the  
27 evidence that Mr. Sullivan was negligent and Mr. Sullivan’s negligence was a substantial factor  
28 in causing his death.

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1 Answer "Yes" or "No" \_\_\_\_\_

2 **Please proceed to Question 11.**

3  
4 11. What percentage of fault do you attribute to each person below? Your answer  
5 may be zero.

6 Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

7 Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

8 Mr. Sullivan: \_\_\_\_\_

9 **Please proceed to Question 12.**

10  
11 12. If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan's Fourth Amendment  
12 rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive and/or by the pointing of firearms at Mr.  
13 Sullivan, and/or that Officer Alvis and/or Officer Keesor violated Mr. Sullivan's Fourth  
14 Amendment rights by the use of deadly force against him, do you find that Minor Sullivan  
15 proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant Officers intentionally interfered  
16 with or attempted to interfere with Mr. Sullivan's civil rights by threatening or committing  
17 violent acts.

18 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Morgado and the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive:

19 \_\_\_\_\_

20 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Morgado and the pointing of firearms at Mr. Sullivan:

21 \_\_\_\_\_

22 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Alvis and the use of deadly force:

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Keesor and the use of deadly force:

25 \_\_\_\_\_

26 **Please proceed to Question 13.**

27

28

1 13. If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, what  
2 damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved  
3 by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Constitutional violation(s).

4 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

5 If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, but found  
6 that Minor Sullivan failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that any actual damages  
7 were caused by the Constitutional violation(s), you shall return an award of nominal damages  
8 not to exceed one dollar.

9 **Please proceed to Question 14.**

10  
11 14. If you answered "Yes" to Question 12, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan,  
12 as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were  
13 caused by the violation.

14 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

15 **Please proceed to Question 15.**

16  
17 15. If you answered "Yes" to Question 9, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as  
18 an individual, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Defendant  
19 Officers' conduct.

20 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

21 **Please sign, date and return this verdict form to the clerk or court security officer.**

22  
23  
24 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

25 **FOREPERSON**

26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7  
8

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9

KATHLEEN ESPINOSA, et al.,

No. C 06-04686 JSW

10

Plaintiffs,

**COURT'S INTENDED SPECIAL  
VERDICT FORM**

11

v.

12

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,

13

Defendants.

14

\_\_\_\_\_ /

15

16 1. Do you find that Minor Asa I. Sullivan ("Minor Sullivan") proved by a  
17 preponderance of the evidence that the tenants, Jarrett Schank and Bryant Gudor, did not  
18 abandon their lease at 2 Garces Drive before June 6, 2006?

19

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

20

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 1, please proceed to Question 2. If you answered "No"  
to Question 1, please proceed to Question 6.**

22

23

2. Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that 2 Garces Drive had been  
abandoned and/or that the landlord, or an authorized agent of the landlord, did not consent to  
the entry and search?

27

Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

28

**If you answered "Yes" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 3. If you answered "No"  
to Question 2, please proceed to Question 6.**

1       3.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2     Mr. Sullivan had a legitimate expectation of privacy at 2 Garces Drive on June 6, 2006?

3     Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

4     **If you answered "Yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4. If you answered "No"**  
5     **to Question 3, please proceed to Question 6.**

6  
7       4.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
8     the Officer Morgado did not have reasonable grounds to believe that there was an emergency at  
9     hand and there was an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property  
10    and/or that the search's scope and manner were not reasonable to meet the need.

11    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

12    **If you answered "Yes" to Question 4, please proceed to Question 5. If you answered "No"**  
13    **to Question 4, please proceed to Question 6.**

14  
15      5.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
16     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
17     Constitution to be free from an unreasonable search when they entered and searched 2 Garces  
18     Drive?

19    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

20    **Please proceed to Question 6.**

21  
22      6.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
23     Officer Morgado deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
24     Constitution to be free from excessive force when he pointed his firearm at Mr. Sullivan?

25    Answer "Yes" or "No": \_\_\_\_\_

26    **Please proceed to Question 7.**

1       7.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
2 the Defendant Officers deprived Mr. Sullivan of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the  
3 Constitution to be free from excessive force when they when they used deadly force against Mr.  
4 Sullivan?

5 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

6 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

7 **Please proceed to Question 8.**

8  
9       8.     **If you answered “No” to Questions 5 and 6, skip this Question and please**  
10 **proceed to Question 9.** If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan’s Fourth  
11 Amendment rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive or by the pointing of firearms at  
12 Mr. Sullivan, do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
13 Officer Morgado intentionally or recklessly provoked a violent response from Mr. Sullivan  
14 when he violated his Fourth Amendment Rights.

15 Answer “Yes” or “No” : \_\_\_\_\_

16 **Please proceed to Question 9.**

17  
18       9.     Do you find that Minor Sullivan proved by a preponderance of the evidence that  
19 the Defendant Officers were negligent in their use of deadly force against Mr. Sullivan?

20 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

21 Answer “Yes” or “No” for Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

22 **If you answered “Yes” to Question 9 as to either Officer Alvis or Officer Keesor, please**  
23 **proceed to Question 10. If you answered “No” to Question 9 as to both Officer Alvis or**  
24 **Officer Keesor, please proceed to Question 12.**

25  
26       10.    Do you find that the Defendant Officers proved by a preponderance of the  
27 evidence that Mr. Sullivan was negligent and Mr. Sullivan’s negligence was a substantial factor  
28 in causing his death.

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1 Answer "Yes" or "No" \_\_\_\_\_

2 **Please proceed to Question 11.**

3  
4 11. What percentage of fault do you attribute to each person below? Your answer  
5 may be zero.

6 Officer Alvis: \_\_\_\_\_

7 Officer Keesor: \_\_\_\_\_

8 Mr. Sullivan: \_\_\_\_\_

9 **Please proceed to Question 12.**

10  
11 12. If you found that Officer Morgado violated Mr. Sullivan's Fourth Amendment  
12 rights by the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive and/or by the pointing of firearms at Mr.  
13 Sullivan, and/or that Officer Alvis and/or Officer Keesor violated Mr. Sullivan's Fourth  
14 Amendment rights by the use of deadly force against him, do you find that Minor Sullivan  
15 proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant Officers intentionally interfered  
16 with or attempted to interfere with Mr. Sullivan's civil rights by threatening or committing  
17 violent acts.

18 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Morgado and the entry and search of 2 Garces Drive:

19 \_\_\_\_\_

20 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Morgado and the pointing of firearms at Mr. Sullivan:

21 \_\_\_\_\_

22 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Alvis and the use of deadly force:

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 Answer "Yes" or "No" as to Officer Keesor and the use of deadly force:

25 \_\_\_\_\_

26 **Please proceed to Question 13.**

27

28

1 13. If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, what  
2 damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved  
3 by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Constitutional violation(s).

4 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

5 If you answered "Yes" to Questions 5, 6, 7, or 8 as to any Defendant Officer, but found  
6 that Minor Sullivan failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that any actual damages  
7 were caused by the Constitutional violation(s), you shall return an award of nominal damages  
8 not to exceed one dollar.

9 **Please proceed to Question 14.**

10  
11 14. If you answered "Yes" to Question 12, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan,  
12 as the successor-in-interest to Mr. Sullivan, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were  
13 caused by the violation.

14 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

15 **Please proceed to Question 15.**

16  
17 15. If you answered "Yes" to Question 9, what damages do you find that Minor Sullivan, as  
18 an individual, proved by a preponderance of the evidence were caused by the Defendant  
19 Officers' conduct.

20 Damages : \_\_\_\_\_

21 **Please sign, date and return this verdict form to the clerk or court security officer.**

22  
23  
24 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

25 **FOREPERSON**

26  
27  
28